~ DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 555 EC 308 770

AUTHOR Rule, Sarah
TITLE Development and Evaluation of a Program To Teach Naturalistic Early Intervention Strategies in Inclusive Environments. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Utah State Univ., Logan. Center for Persons with Disabilities.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 39p.
CONTRACT H029K50148
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Aids; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Disabilities; *Early Intervention; *Inclusive Schools; Inservice Education; Instructional Materials; Postsecondary Education; Preschool Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Development; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Utah State University

ABSTRACT

This final report describes the development and evaluation of a project that was funded by the U.S. Department of Education to develop, evaluate, revise, and disseminate a video-assisted, competency-referenced curriculum to teach naturalistic intervention strategies in inclusive, early intervention settings. The project, called Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings (SPIES), was designed for inservice and preservice education of team members representing a variety of disciplines. The proposed curriculum is formatted into the following six modules: (1) Creating Teaching Opportunities; (2) Providing Help; (3) Incidental Teaching; (4) Tracking Progress; (5) Prior to Preschool; and (6) Planning across the Day. The modules include both videotape and print materials, and are available in both English and Spanish. A condensed CD-ROM version allows instructors to customize the information to their personnel development activities. Over 100 users from several states including interdisciplinary agency personnel, families, university faculty, and students participated in a formative and summative evaluation. Project personnel revised the curriculum after each field test. Evaluation methods and accomplishments of the project are described in the report. The summary of results indicates that preservice and inservice educators are able to use SPIES to teach others and that participants learn about naturalistic intervention strategies from the experience. An outreach project was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education requesting funds to disseminate the SPIES curriculum and to provide support to those who use it. Summary tables of participants' ratings in evaluations are included. (SG)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 460 555

Development and Evaluation of a Program to Teach Naturalistic Early Intervention Strategies in Inclusive Environments

Final Report

Grant #H029K50148

Project period 08/01/95-01/31/99

Awarded to:
Utah State University
Center for Persons with Disabilities
6800 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-6800

Sarah Rule, Ph.D., Principal Investigator

Submitted to U.S. Department of Education
April, 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EC 308770

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This Project addressed National Educational Goal One, that by the year 2000, "Children will enter school ready to learn." Preschool and early intervention services for young children with disabilities and their families are critical to achieve this goal (U.S. Department of Education, 1991). However, personnel must be prepared to deliver these services, and, according to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to deliver them in least restrictive or natural environments. These are the environments where their same-aged peers who do not have disabilities are to be found–for example, schools, preschools and child care homes and centers. To assure that personnel teams (special educators, early childhood educators, child care and related service personnel, and family members) are able to provide the necessary supports to serve young children with disabilities in inclusive settings, curricula for use in inservice and preservice training are urgently needed. Curricula that teach naturalistic intervention strategies are particularly suited to address this need, as these are effective with children whose disabilities vary in type and severity. Also, these strategies can be used across settings: homes, preschools, child care and other community environments.

The purpose of this project was to develop, evaluate, revise, and disseminate a video-assisted, competency-referenced curriculum to teach naturalistic intervention. Called Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings (SPIES), it was designed for inservice and preservice education of team members representing disciplines concerned with the provision of early intervention (defined here as services to children with disabilities aged birth to 5 years and to their families). The proposed curriculum is formatted into six modules for maximal user flexibility: Creating Teaching Opportunities (how to identify opportunities to teach during everyday activities, routines, and events), Providing Help, Incidental Teaching, Tracking Progress, Prior to Preschool (adapted strategies for early intervention), and Planning Across the Day. Each module includes a videotape and print manuals for instructors/leaders and participants. Manuals are available in English and Spanish. The videotapes are captioned, with both English and Spanish versions available. A condensed CD-ROM version allows instructors who so desire to customize the information to their personnel development activities.

Each module includes group and field-based activities. Video examples model the use of naturalistic strategies to facilitate analysis and reflection about issues that must be taken into account when applying such strategies. Suggested group and individual activities address the application and refinement of strategies.

A systematic research and development field test model was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Over 100 users from several states including interdisciplinary agency personnel, families, university faculty, and students participated in formative and summative evaluation. Project personnel revised the curriculum after each field test.

Initial national dissemination will use the catalog distribution system of the Center for Persons with Disabilities, Utah State University. An outreach project was submitted to the U.S. Department of Education requesting funds to disseminate the SPIES curriculum and to provide support to those who use it. Dr. Sarah Rule served as the Project's principal investigator and Mr. Tim Smith as coordinator.

Description of Curriculum Developed with Project Support

This purpose of this project, "Development and Evaluation of a Program to Teach Naturalistic Early Intervention Strategies in Inclusive Environments," was to produce a curriculum that could be used in preservice and inservice education to teach adults methods to provide services and supports to young children with disabilities and their families. Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings is a curriculum to teach adults to use naturalistic intervention strategies such as incidental teaching and milieu language intervention as they interact with young children with disabilities. Using everyday settings as the context for intervention, SPIES shows, through motion video, how adults can plan and carry out intervention and how they can determine if intervention was successful. The curriculum illustrates how adults may take advantage of everyday settings to provide intervention that can help children master a variety of goals and objectives.

Naturalistic methods of instruction have the following characteristics:

- They are used in everyday settings,
- they incorporate developmentally and individually appropriate activities, and
- they are based on a child's interest.

The SPIES curriculum is divided into six modules: Creating Teaching Opportunities, Providing Help, Incidental Teaching, Tracking Progress, Prior to Preschool, and Planning Intervention Across the Day. These modules illustrate the use of strategies by showing adults and children with varying disabilities as they interact in a variety of settings and work on many different skills. The modules also describe ways to plan intervention in settings such as preschool classrooms where many children are involved and suggest ways to evaluate whether strategies are working as intended to promote children's skill development. Each module is

accompanied by a videotape and the program includes print support materials (manuals for instructors and participants), available in English and Spanish. Videotapes are captioned in English or Spanish. A condensed version of SPIES for use by individuals, rather than by a group led by an instructor, is available on CD ROM in English only.

Accomplishment of Objectives

The Project objectives were to (a) produce a draft curriculum, (b) conduct formative evaluation on which to base curriculum revisions, (c) conduct summative evaluation in both preservice and inservice courses and sessions, and (d) broadly disseminate the revised, field-tested curriculum. These objectives were accomplished and, as described above, the Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings (SPIES) resulted. The distinction between formative and summative evaluation was somewhat blurred, as Project personnel revised the curriculum after every round of field testing, including that which occurred during Year 3. The accomplishment of objectives is described below, including the results of each round of curriculum evaluation.

Summary of results of formative and summative evaluation activities

Evaluation results indicated that (a) preservice and inservice educators are able to use SPIES to teach others and (b) participants learn about naturalistic intervention strategies from the experience. In its first year, the project conducted two rounds of evaluation with staff as facilitators. In subsequent years, field testing included 8 rounds of evaluation in 8 agencies in 5 states where non project-affiliated personnel were facilitators, and 1 round that addressed individual rather than group education using the SPIES' CD-ROM version. The participating agencies included institutions of higher education (IHEs), Head Starts, local education agencies, and child care providers.

The educational levels of participants in SPIES' training ranged from high school to master's degrees. Participants included members of diverse cultures (particularly of the Ute tribal Head Start program and an urban Head Start program in Seattle) and individuals with disabilities (sensory impairments). The instructors were also diverse, including (a) faculty and staff of the Universities of Wyoming, South Carolina, and Washington and Utah State University, (b) the instructor of an inservice course for child care providers, and (c) a local education agency special education supervisor. All indicated that SPIES content was relevant, the format was easy to use, and they intended to continue to use it in personnel preparation. Data from the developers' use with Head Start personnel indicated that participants found the curriculum informative.

Ninety-six individuals participated in evaluation rounds in which SPIES was taught by non project-affiliated personnel. Participants' self ratings indicated that their knowledge increased as a result of SPIES training. Across modules, a mean of 83% rated their knowledge as improved. These ratings were corroborated by pre and post tests of module content administered in several field evaluations. Participants rated their intent to use the strategies taught in each module. Across modules, the mean percentage who said they intended to use the strategies was 92%. Comments made in response to open ended questions were typically positive. Their collective suggestions were incorporated into three revisions of the curriculum.

The CD ROM curriculum format was evaluated in a more limited but in depth manner by five adults who used each module independently and convened to share their experiences in a weekly focus group. The group included a regular preschool teacher, an early childhood special educator, a family member of a child with a disability, a paraeducator in a preschool, and a Head Start staff member. Their suggestions were consistent with those of participants who used the

curriculum in group learning experiences. An indicant of their enthusiasm was that each asked to retain the CD for future use, two in order to teach the strategies to other team members.

Evaluation questions, methods, and results

The Project used both qualitative and quantitative methods in seeking answers to the evaluation questions. The questions were:

1. Do expert reviewers favorably rate the curriculum content and instructional processes?

2. Do participants demonstrate mastery of didactic content as evidenced by written work, participation in class activities, and self evaluation?

3. Can participants implement strategies as observed on video tape?

4. Do participants perceive that the curriculum will help them to implement naturalistic strategies?

5. Do participants report collaboration with colleagues to refine their use of naturalistic strategies in order to achieve desired outcomes in their own homes or intervention settings?

6. Do university faculty and agency inservice leaders favorably rate the curriculum content and processes?

7. Do agencies and institutions of higher education express interest in obtaining the curriculum?

Measures. The multiple measures (see Appendix for examples of instruments) used to gather data with which to answer evaluation questions included (a) participants' and instructors' satisfaction with the program and with each module, measured with Likert type ratings of program format and content; (b) open ended questions soliciting feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of each module, also completed by participants and instructors; (c) knowledge checks administered before and after participants completed training in each module, administered in several rounds of evaluation; (d) focus groups conducted in several sites (Ute Tribal Head Start and evaluators of CD ROM SPIES version in particular); (e) one instructor's

direct observation of videotapes showing participants' implementation of strategies in selected modules (Utah State University early childhood special education distance program); and (f) analysis of comments logged in structured conversations with instructors and expert evaluators.

Evaluation processes. Question 1 was addressed during each Project year. Evaluators included Leslie Snow Kemblowski, the parent of a young child with disabilities; Mary Frances Hanline, faculty member at Florida State University; Utah State University early childhood special education faculty and staff members Cynthia Rowland, Marlene Deer, and Barbara Fiechtl and graduate students Jennie Akers and Marion Tso; Child Care Resource and Referral specialist Debbie Griffin (who served child care providers in northern Utah); University of Washington faculty members Ilene Schwartz and Joseph Stowitschek; University of South Carolina faculty member Bill Brown; University of Wyoming faculty member Michelle Buchanan; Tahoma District WA Special Services Coordinator Annette Whittlesey; and co-directors of the Princeton Child Development Institute, Patricia Krantz and Lynn McClannahan. With the exception of reviewers Kemblowski, Akers, Krantz, and McClannahan, and the reviewers who individually used SPIES' CD ROM, all reviewers taught participants (or arranged for their staff to do so) using one or more SPIES modules in the context of preservice or inservice education. These individuals provided extensive written comments as well as oral comments during interviews that staff taped and transcribed or logged as they occurred. Those individuals who did not teach with the curriculum reviewed the videotape or CD ROM format of the curriculum, commenting extensively on content accuracy and ease of use.

In addition to curriculum evaluation by non-project affiliated experts, Project staff taught Head Start personnel from two different agencies, using the first version of SPIES. They collected extensive data on participants' satisfaction with content, format, and usefulness.

The collective comments of these reviewers along with participants' evaluations and results of knowledge checks provided the data base from which to revise the print materials and videotapes. Print materials were revised after each round of evaluation and the videotapes during each year of the Project. The CD ROM was revised during the third year. The final revisions were completed during a six month no cost extension period, permitting re-editing of all videos.

Questions 2, 4, 5 and 6 were addressed in each phase of evaluation. As described above, participants' self ratings and changes in pre-post knowledge checks indicated that their knowledge of naturalistic instruction increased after their completing SPIES modules. Logs of discussion in evaluations led or observed by Project staff indicated that participants actively participated in discussion and group and individual activities. Participants expressed high levels of satisfaction with the curriculum. There was no direct measurement of collaborative activities. Participants' comments, however, suggested that they would use the materials with other team members. For example, a preschool special educator who used the CD ROM format in Year 3 asked to use it to teach her paraeducator how to use techniques illustrated as did a special educator who used the videotape curriculum. Faculty and inservice leaders favorably rated the usability of the curriculum. They especially liked the motion video segments.

Question 3, whether participants could implement strategies as observed on videotape, was evaluated with a limited sample of participants. Six Utah State University students enrolled in a distance education course used two modules and submitted videotapes of themselves as they taught young children in rural preschool classrooms. They were able to use the planning strategies. Their implementation of strategies before receiving instructor feedback was variable in accuracy. Thus, the modules seemed a necessary but not sufficient means to assure that students implemented strategies appropriately. Supervisory feedback was necessary to help some

students to use the strategies effectively, as judged from child progress data.

Question 7, whether agencies and institutions of higher education express interest in obtaining the curriculum, was answered by recording requests for information following dissemination activities. These records served to identify potential consumers and to inform them of the availability of the curriculum.

Summary of Participants' Ratings in Evaluations Conducted by Non-Project-Affiliated Personnel

Table 1, on the following pages, summarizes the results of evaluation of SPIES in sites not affiliated with Utah State University. The first column shows the evaluation site and instructor or facilitator. The second describes the participants. The third column shows, by module, the mean of participants' ratings of video content, video examples, and group activities (discussion, reviews, and practice activities). The fourth and fifth columns show the percentage of participants whose post-training self ratings of knowledge were higher than their pre-training ratings, and the percentages in each group who stated that they intended to use the strategies in the course of their work. Finally, comments are briefly summarized.

Different modules were used in different rounds of evaluation. Module titles are abbreviated and explained in a footnote at the end of the table.

Site and Facilitator	Participant Description	Mean Ratings by Module (1=low 5=high)					Knowledge: Post test self rating higher than pre (% of participants)	Intent to use (% yes, by module)	Sample Comments
		Video Content	Video Examples	Discussions	Review Activities	Practice Activities			
Florida State University, Tallahassee Dr. Mary Frances Hanline	Students (n=19), 7 employed in special education, middle school, preschool; education ranged from bachelors to masters; used independently	3.0 (CTO)[a] 4.0 (PH)[b] 4.3 (IT)[c] 4.3 (TP)[d] 3.8 (P to P)[e] 5.0 (PaD)[f]	4.5 5.0 4.1 4.3 4.2 5.0	4.5 5.0 3.7 4.5 4.0 5.0	4.0 4.0 3.7 4.0 3.8 5.0	5.0 - 4.2 4.0 3.0 5.0	50% 100% 75% 100% - -	100% 100% 86% 100% 90% 100%	Good examples, organization; wanted more examples on Prior to Preschool

Site and Facilitator	Participant Description	Mean Ratings by Module (1=low 5=high)					Knowledge: Post test self rating higher than pre (% of participants)	Intent to use (% yes, by module)	Sample Comments
		Video Content	Video Examples	Discussions	Review Activities	Practice Activities			
University of South Carolina, Columbia Dr. Bill Brown	Summer school course (n=14); most students working toward master's degree; employment included special education, regular preschool, kindergarten and ESL classrooms and related	4.2 (CTO) 4.4 (PH) 4.4 (IT) 4.4 (TP) 4.2 (P to P) 4.5 (PaD)	4.6 4.6 4.7 4.6 4.5 4.7	4.0 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.2 4.3	4.7 4.3 4.5 4.6 4.5 4.6	4.6 4.4 4.4 4.5 4.5 4.5	77% 92% 93% 93% - -	93% 86% 93% 86% 90% 86%	Good content and examples

Site and Facilitator	Participant Description	Mean Ratings by Module (1=low 5=high)					Knowledge: Post test self rating higher than pre (% of participants)	Intent to use (% yes, by module)	Sample Comments
		Video Content	Video Examples	Discussions	Review Activities	Practice Activities			
University of Wyoming, Laramie Dr. Michelle Buchanan	Distance education courses (n=11): 7 students employed in special education preschool, Head Start, child care, elementary education; range from high school education to BA degree	3.6 (CTO) 3.5 (PH) 3.8 (IT)	3.4 3.8 3.3	2.4 2.3 2.3	3.4 3.0 3.0	2.0 3.0 3.0	90% 75% 80%	80% 75% 75%	Useful in distance learning; generated discussion of DAP, teacher direction

Site and Facilitator	Participant Description	Mean Ratings by Module (1=low 5=high)					Knowledge: Post test self rating higher than pre (% of participants)	Intent to use (% yes, by module)	Sample Comments
		Video Content	Video Examples	Discussions	Review Activities	Practice Activities			
Utah State University, Logan Barbara Fiechtl	Early childhood special education students (n=10): no degrees	3.5 (TP)	4.0	3.3	3.8	3.3	-	100%	Practical, used in practicum

Site and Facilitator	Participant Description	Mean Ratings by Module (1=low 5=high)					Knowledge: Post test self rating higher than pre (% of participants)	Intent to use (% yes, by module)	Sample Comments
		Video Content	Video Examples	Discussions	Review Activities	Practice Activities			
Tahoma School District, Washington State, Special Services Staff Member	Paraeducators, special education, and general education teachers (n=17) employed in classrooms preschool through high school; education ranged from high school to master's degree	3.6 (PH) 3.7 (TP)	4.1 4.0	3.4 3.6	3.7 4.1	3.6 3.9	- 83%	73% 92%	Video examples good, wanted more

Site and Facilitator	Participant Description	Mean Ratings by Module (1=low 5=high)					Knowledge: Post test self rating higher than pre (% of participants)	Intent to use (% yes, by module)	Sample Comments
		Video Content	Video Examples	Discussions	Review Activities	Practice Activities			
Head Start (Seattle, Washington) Presenter: Inservice Educator, Agency	Head Start personnel (n=20); education range high school to MA degrees; 4 also parents of young children with disabilities; 50% from diverse races and cultures	4.4 (PH)	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.9	80%	100%	Videos helpful, some confusion about levels of help; practice activities good

Site and Facilitator	Participant Description	Mean Ratings by Module (1=low 5=high)					Knowledge: Post test self rating higher than pre (% of participants)	Intent to use (% yes, by module)	Sample Comments
		Video Content	Video Examples	Discussions	Review Activities	Practice Activities			
Child and Family Focus, Northern Utah, Debbie Griffen (staff member)	Child care providers (n=5); range from high school to BA degree	4.8 (CTO)	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.3	75%	100%	Video examples good; activities encouraged learning
		4.5 (PH)	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	100%	100%	
		4.0 (IT)	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.3	75%	100%	
		5.0 (TP)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	67%	100%	
		4.5 (P to P)	4.7	4.0	4.3	5.0	-	100%	
		4.5 (PaD)	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.2	-	-	

Footnote: a = Creating Teaching Opportunities; b = Providing Help; c = Incidental Teaching

d = Tracking Progress; e = Prior to Preschool; f = Planning Across the Day

Qualitative results: Summary of revisions undertaken in response to participants' and instructors' comments. The purpose of formative evaluation was to provide information on which to base curriculum revision. Analysis of the extensive transcripts and logs of participants' comments and those they made in writing was particularly useful in helping staff to define changes that would improve the SPIES curriculum. The table below summarizes the general categories of revisions resulting from the various rounds of evaluation.

Table 2. Summary of evaluation rounds and resulting curriculum revisions.

Evaluation Description	Positive Attributes	Revisions Implemented
Expert – 1 parent, 1 faculty	Content good Format user friendly	Some video scenes revised to better portray strategies; changes made in vocabulary
Four modules taught by Project personnel to 21 Ute Tribal Head Start	Content and format informative, appropriate, relevant, well organized	Allowed more time to complete activities and to view video scenes
Four modules taught by Project personnel to 16 Bear River Head Start personnel	Content & format informative, appropriate, culturally sensitive, well organized	Revised manual to allow users time to complete activities
Selected modules taught in 4 preservice classes at Utah State University; 6 and 9 students enrolled via distance education, respectively, 10 and 4, respectively, enrolled on campus	Content informative and useful	Reformatted manual for ease of use with videos Revised video scenarios in first module to better differentiate strategies Revised content for conceptual clarity (redeveloped modules)
Selected modules taught in preservice classes at University of Washington	Manual well organized, easy to use; content clear; discussion materials useful	Video examples revised to improve clarity, content accuracy & consistency; orientation material developed

Selected modules taught via distance education, University of Wyoming	Strategies useful, tapes well suited for distance education	Revised content to clarify issues of adult and child initiations and promoting independence
Modules 2 & 3 taught in Dinise Louie Education Center (Head Start and preschool) inservice, Seattle, Washington	Useful content for diverse participants	Replaced footage showing narrator with voice-overs
All modules used in preservice course at Florida State University, 19 students used independently	Content useful Sequencing of content and activities useful	Made technical revisions to video scenarios
Modules 4-6 taught in Tahoma (Washington) district inservice	Video examples useful	Reformatted sequences of activities (viewing of examples, discussion, other class activities)
All modules taught in preservice education, University of South Carolina	Content and format useful	Revised narration
All modules taught in course for child care providers	Content useful for child care providers	Added activities to be completed in class
Focus group (6 child care, preschool special education, parents & paraprofessional staff) evaluation of CD ROM	Content useful; format easy to use	Corrected technical problems with CD ROM links; revised print materials
Expert evaluation by program directors, Princeton Child Development Institute	Judicious selection of content Formats useful	Revised content of several modules for conceptual accuracy; added examples to print materials; added scenarios, re-edited all videos

Summary of evaluation results for training conducted by Project-affiliated personnel. The tables below describe the results from the training conducted by Project personnel. The original four modules of the SPIES curriculum were formatively evaluated by Head Start personnel from two different programs. Beginning evaluation with Head Start

allowed for evaluation by a diverse group of participants. These evaluations used different evaluation forms from those used by non-Project-affiliated personnel. Shown below are participants' ratings of contents and format and perceptions of the impact of the training.

The first round was conducted with the Ute Tribal Head Start program, which serves more than 200 families and is based in Fort Duchesne, Utah. Twenty two individuals completed the modules during 10 inservice sessions; these were delivered approximately weekly over an 11 week period. Project Coordinator Steve Dennis and graduate student Linda Chadburn conducted respective inservice sessions. The participants evaluated each module in writing, completed pre and post tests addressing the content of each module, and discussed the program in a focus group conducted by an individual not associated with the Project. While their responses in class were not videotaped, the instructors noted where their questions and discussion indicated that the content of the modules was confusing. Their ratings of the program are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Ute Tribal Head Start participants' ratings of original four modules of "Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings."

UTE TRIBAL HEAD START		**Module 1**	**Module 2**	**Module 3**	**Module 4**
	Sample Size	*20-23*	*19-20*	*20-21*	*16-18*
	Range	*1=Strongly Disagree 3=Undecided 5=Strongly Agree*			
ABOUT THE VIDEO CONTENT					
		Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*
What I expected		2.95 (1.00)	2.85 (1.04)	3.10 (1.14)	2.88 (1.05)
Appropriate		3.57 (1.27)	3.90 (1.04)	3.62 (1.07)	3.38 (1.09)
Well Organized		4.15 (.81)	3.75 (1.07)	3.50 (.95)	3.65 (.70)
Relevant		3.81 (1.29)	3.65 (1.18)	3.62 (1.12)	3.35 (1.11)
Timely		3.19 (1.08)	3.65 (.99)	3.62 (.97)	3.65 (.79)

Informative	4.36 (.90)	4.10 (1.02)	4.10 (.70)	3.94 (.66)
Culturally Respectful	2.85 (1.18)	2.65 (1.09)	2.86 (1.20)	2.75 (1.24)
ABOUT CHANGE ATTRIBUTED TO THE PROGRAM				
	Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*
Knowledge of NI	3.65 (1.19)	4.10 (1.02)	3.55 (.94)	3.50 (1.38)
Ability to Discuss	3.52 (1.08)	3.80 (1.01)	3.40 (1.10)	3.56 (1.04)
Desire to Implement	3.87 (1.18)	4.05 (.89)	3.90 (.45)	3.59 (.80)
Ability to Implement	3.26 (1.14)	3.30 (.80)	3.14 (1.01)	3.22 (.94)
New Ideas for Activities	3.83 (1.15)	3.60 (1.14)	3.71 (1.06)	3.17 (1.04)
ABOUT THE APPROACH TO PRESENT INFORMATION				
	Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*
Program too Long/too Short	3.27 (.63)	3.26 (.45)	3.14 (.48)	3.06 (.42)
Participant Interaction too Long/too Short	3.05 (.58)	3.20 (.70)	3.14 (.73)	3.00 (.59)
Video Scenes Helpful	3.82 (1.18)	3.60 (1.10)	3.81 (1.03)	3.28 (1.18)
Blinking Icons Helpful	3.30 (1.06)	3.63 (1.12)	3.33 (1.02)	3.53 (.72)
Group Discussion Helpful	3.74 (1.48)	4.11 (1.20)	3.57 (1.29)	3.41 (1.28)
Enough Time to Complete Manual	2.78 (1.09)	3.30 (1.26)	2.76 (.89)	2.82 (1.51)
Overall Like the Format	4.27 (.77)	3.89 (.88)	3.95 (.86)	3.81 (.83)

The second evaluation by Head Start personnel was conducted in five sessions over a seven week period. These 16 Head Start team members are affiliated with the Bear River Head Start Association, which serves 306 families in seven counties in northern Utah and southern Idaho. Results are shown below.

Table 4. Bear River Head Start participants' ratings of modules 1 through 4, "Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings."

BEAR RIVER HEAD START		Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Module 4
	Sample Size	*20-21*	*19-20*	*20-21*	*16-18*
	Range	*1=Strongly Disagree 3=Undecided 5=Strongly Agree*			
ABOUT THE VIDEO CONTENT					
		Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*
What I expected		2.23 (1.30)	3.59 (1.46)	4.15 (.99)	3.73 (1.10)
Appropriate		5.00 (00)	4.56 (.73)	4.54 (.88)	4.27 (1.10)
Well Organized		4.69 (.63)	4.25 (.86)	4.15 (1.28)	4.00 (.93)
Relevant		4.91 (.30)	4.31 (1.14)	4.38 (.96)	4.00 (1.30)
Timely		4.58 (.79)	4.53 (.64)	4.69 (.63)	4.43 (.76)
Informative		4.92 (.28)	4.75 (.58)	4.46 (1.13)	4.40 (1.12)
Culturally Respectful		4.00 (1.60)	3.88 (1.45)	4.15 (1.28)	3.64 (1.65)
ABOUT CHANGE ATTRIBUTED TO THE PROGRAM					
		Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*
Knowledge of NI		5.00 (00)	4.06 (1.24)	4.31 (.95)	4.87 (.35)
Ability to Discuss		4.67 (.65)	4.13 (1.20)	4.38 (.96)	4.53 (.64)
Desire to Implement		4.67 (.65)	4.38 (1.09)	4.54 (.66)	4.50 (1.16)
Ability to Implement		4.25 (1.06)	4.06 (1.18)	4.38 (.77)	4.33 (.90)
New Ideas for Activities		4.00 (1.22)	4.35 (.70)	4.15 (1.14)	3.60 (1.30)
ABOUT THE APPROACH TO PRESENT INFORMATION					
		Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*
Program too Long/too Short		2.92 (.51)	2.81 (.66)	2.92 (.28)	2.53 (.64)
Participant Interaction too Long /too Short		3.25 (.75)	3.19 (.54)	3.15 (.38)	3.20 (.56)
Video Scenes Helpful		4.77 (.44)	4.59 (.87)	4.38 (.87)	4.07 (1.16)
Blinking Icons Helpful		3.62 (1.12)	4.24 (1.03)	3.38 (1.45)	2.87 (1.13)
Group Discussion Helpful		4.67 (.49)	4.12 (1.36)	4.77 (.60)	4.80 (.41)
Enough Time to Complete Manual		3.00 (1.63)	3.06 (1.56)	4.15 (1.34)	3.60 (1.55)
Overall Like the Format		4.42 (.79)	4.50 (.73)	4.54 (.66)	4.21 (.80)

Dissemination

Project coordinator Tim Smith created a web site for the Project at the address: http://www.cpd.usu.edu/html/SPIES/SPIES.html. Project personnel also produced brochures for distribution in the Center for Persons with Disabilities Product Catalog, by mail, and at conferences. The following publications and presentations addressed the Project:

Chadburn, L. (1996, March). Providing help. Utah's Statewide Preschool Conference, Salt Lake City.

Dennis. S. (1995). Video-based materials developed to teach principles of naturalistic instruction. *Exceptional News*, 19(1), pp. 4,5.

Smith, T. (1997, June). The evaluation of a multimedia-based training program for special education personnel: Design, development and delivery issues. Presentation to ED-MEDIA & ED-TELECOM Conference, Calgary, Canada.

Smith, T. (1998, March). Creating teaching opportunities. Presentation to Utah's Statewide Preschool Conference, Salt Lake City.

Fiechtl, B. (1998, March). Tracking progress. Presentation to Utah's Statewide Preschool Conference, Salt Lake City.

In addition to these formal presentations, Sarah Rule displayed the SPIES curriculum and brochures at the Early Childhood Project Meeting held in Washington, D.C. from January 31 through February 3, 1999. She also submitted the curriculum to the Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) institute supported by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services for evaluation for inclusion into its data base.

Project Personnel

Sarah Rule served as Project Director. During the Project's first year, Steven Dennis served as coordinator, succeeded by Timothy Smith in the second and third years. Celeste Reynolds served as instructional design and development specialist. The following graduate students contributed to development and/or editing of modules: Marion Tso, author of "Incidental Teaching" and "Planning across the Day" and co-editor of "Creating Teaching Opportunities," and "Tracking Progress;" Jamie Mecham, author of "Prior to Preschool;" Linda Chadburn, co-editor of "Tracking Progress," "Creating Teaching Opportunities,"and "Providing Help". Jennie Akers assisted in module evaluation and development of glossaries. Modules One, Two, and Six, "Creating Teaching Opportunities," "Providing Help," and "Planning Across the Day," made extensive use of videotapes and content of the Strategies for Instruction in Natural Environments, a videodisc-assisted curriculum developed by Cynthia Rowland, Marlene Deer, Zandria Merrill and Sarah Rule, with support from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (grant #H029K10014). Video production was done by the K-SAR studios of the Center for Persons with Disabilities. Michael Blakely produced the CD ROM templates. Translators for Spanish print materials and captions were Paul Ryan Bohman, Jeremy T. Stroup and Arlene Fuentes.

APPENDIX

The following pages include evaluation forms for one module.

Similar forms were used for the others.

Evaluation Survey (Participant)

Name_____ **Date**_____

1. What is your educational background? Please circle all that apply:

   High School CDA Associates Bachelors Masters Ph.D

   Other (please specify)_____

   Areas of Emphasis? Please check all that apply:

   - ❑ Special Education
   - ❑ Early Childhood Special Education
   - ❑ Child Development/Family Relations
   - ❑ Elementary Education
   - ❑ Physical Therapy
   - ❑ Occupational Therapy
   - ❑ Speech & Language Pathology
   - ❑ Nursing
   - ❑ Social Work
   - ❑ Psychology
   - ❑ Educational Administration
   - ❑ Other (please specify)_____

2. What is your current job title: _____

3. Which items characterize your current responsibilities?

   - ❑ Preservice education
   - ❑ Early intervention
   - ❑ Inservice education
   - ❑ Direct service to children and families
   - ❑ Childcare Provider
   - ❑ Other (please specify)_____

©1997 Utah State University, Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings

Evaluation Survey (Facilitator)

Name_____ **Date**_____

1. What is your educational background? Please circle all that apply:

   High School CDA Associates Bachelors Masters Ph.D

   Other (please specify)_____

   Areas of Emphasis? Please check all that apply:

   - ❑ Special Education
   - ❑ Early Childhood Special Education
   - ❑ Child Development/Family Relations
   - ❑ Elementary Education
   - ❑ Physical Therapy
   - ❑ Occupational Therapy
   - ❑ Speech & Language Pathology
   - ❑ Nursing
   - ❑ Social Work
   - ❑ Psychology
   - ❑ Educational Administration
   - ❑ Other (please specify)_____

2. What is your current job title: _____

3. Which items characterize your current responsibilities?

   - ❑ Preservice education
   - ❑ Early intervention
   - ❑ Inservice education
   - ❑ Direct service to children and families
   - ❑ Other (please specify)_____

©1997 Utah State University, Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings

Evaluation Survey (Facilitator)

How are the Materials to be Used?

1. Which modules will be used?

   - ❑ Module 1: Creating Teaching Opportunities
   - ❑ Module 2: Providing Help
   - ❑ Module 3: Incidental Teaching
   - ❑ Module 4: Tracking Progress
   - ❑ Module 5: Prior to Preschool
   - ❑ Module 6: Planning Intervention Across the Day

2. How many sessions are scheduled for completing the modules?_____
3. How much time is planned for each session (1hr, 2hrs)? _____
4. How often will sessions be held? _____
5. List the order the modules will be presented in?

   Session 1: _____

   Session 2: _____

   Session 3: _____

   Session 4: _____

   Session 5: _____

   Session 6: _____

©1997 Utah State University, Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings

Evaluation Pre-test

Name_____ **Date**_____

Instructions

Read the following overview and rate your knowledge of the topic "creating teaching opportunities". Then complete the pre-test. If you are unable to answer or do not understand an item, please leave the item blank.

Overview of this Module

In this module, we discuss eight techniques for creating teaching opportunities that are based on a child's initations and a child's interest. These techniques include: manding, choices, access, insufficient materials, inadequate portions, unexpected events, commenting and expanding. These techniques can be used individually or together in a variety of everyday settings.

Rating

My knowledge of this topic on a scale of 1 to 5 with **one being very low** and **five being very high** is (circle one):

1 2 3 4 5

Pre-test

1. Define each of the following:

   a. child interest:

   b. child initiation:

   c. teaching opportunity:

2. Describe how a child's interest, a child's intiation, and a teaching opportunity are related.

©1997 Utah State University, Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings

Evaluation Pre-test

3. Listed below are the eight techniques for creating teaching opportunities and their definitions. Put the letter associated with the technique in front of the correct definition.

   a. commenting
   b. access
   c. inadequate portions
   d. choices
   e. manding
   f. insufficient materials
   g. expanding
   h. unexpected events

____ 1. Adding one or two elements to what the child says.

____ 2. Telling a child to say or do something or asking a question that requires more than a yes or no answer.

____ 3. Giving a child less of a favored item than the child wants.

____ 4. Placing desired objects out of a child's reach.

____ 5. Saying or doing something that the child doesn't expect based on their current understanding.

____ 6. Giving a child all but one item needed for an activity.

____ 7. Attaching labels to what a child or adult has, sees or does.

____ 8. Setting up an environment where the child has the opportunity to choose between different objects, events or activities.

©1997 Utah State University, Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings

Evaluation Questionnaire (Participant)

Name_____ **Date**_____

Rate each of the following items on a scale of 1 to 5 with **one being low** and **five being high**. Justify your rating in the comments section. Please use the back for additional comments.

Item	Rating	Comments
Video Content	1 2 3 4 5	
Video Examples	1 2 3 4 5	
Stop and Discuss Activities	1 2 3 4 5	
Review Materials	1 2 3 4 5	
Practice Activities	1 2 3 4 5	

2. Are the intervention strategies presented in this module applicable in your current professional responsibilities? Yes No

   Why or why not? _____

   _____

3. Do you intend to use these intervention strategies in your work? Yes No

   Why or why not?_____

   _____

®1997 Utah State University, Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings

Evaluation Questionnaire (Facilitator)

Name_____ **Date**_____

Rate each of the following items on a scale of 1 to 5 with **one being low** and **five being high**. Justify your rating in the comments section. Please use the back for additional comments.

Item	Rating	Comments
Video Content	1 2 3 4 5	
Video Examples	1 2 3 4 5	
Stop and Discuss Activities	1 2 3 4 5	
Review Materials	1 2 3 4 5	
Practice Activities	1 2 3 4 5	

2. Are the intervention strategies presented in this module applicable to the participants' professional responsibilities? Yes No

   Why or why not? _____

   _____

3. Do you feel that participants could effectively use these intervention strategies? Yes No

   Why or why not?_____

   _____

©1997 Utah State University, Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings